UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,738	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.097US1	9935

45809 7590 06/29/2005

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/557,738	GJERSTAD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 20-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 20-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 4/4/2005.

2. Claims 1-5 and 20-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 20, and 23 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Maslov, US 6,466,240 B1 provisional application filed 7/8/1998 and Froessl, US 5,109,439 patented 4/28/1992.

Regarding independent claim 1, Saunders teaches a text store interface to permit an application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders teaches a text processor input method for attaching a property to the document in at least one position in the document, wherein the property preserves a relationship between a text service and the identified range in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38. In col. 6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the

range of text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text. Saunders teaches a text input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders does not, however teach that the property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction. Saunders teaches a tree structure for organizing the document content in fig. 3, but does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Maslov does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in the abstract, col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 17, and col. 3 lines 26-44. Maslov can select or anchor nodes of text for manipulation by the user. Froessl does teach attaching a property to a document, wherein the property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Maslov and Froessl into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text interface taught by Maslov to have improved Saunders so that the documents editable by Saunders would have included structured document trees consisting of nodes of text. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the original data access facilitating text correction as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the

text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the teaching of Froessl.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Saunders teaches a method for selecting at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders teaches wherein the method selects the text stream interface for documents stored as an array and the dynamic interface for documents stored in a tree-based structure in fig. 3.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Saunders teaches a range object in which a range within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such that the handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Saunders teaches insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Saunders teaches wherein the text input processor interface further permits the handler for the input device to attach the property to the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38. In col. 6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the range of text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders also

teaches an application which selects at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Maslov does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in the abstract, col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 17, and col. 3 lines 26-44. Maslov can select or anchor nodes of text for manipulation by the user. Froessl does teach attaching a property to a document, wherein the property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Maslov and Froessl into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text interface taught by Maslov to have improved Saunders so that the documents editable by Saunders would have included structured document trees consisting of nodes of text. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the original data access facilitating text correction as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the teaching of Froessl.

5. Claims 20, 21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Froessl, US 5,109,439 patented 4/28/1992.

Regarding independent claim 20, Saunders teaches a text input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a range object in which a range within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such that the handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a method by which the handler is able to attach a property to the document at a range specified by the range object, wherein the property preserves a relationship between a text service and the identified range in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38. In col. 6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the range of text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text. Saunders does not, however teach that the property provides access to original data used for insertion of text within the range.

Froessl does teach attaching a property to a document, wherein the property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Froessl into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the original data access facilitating text correction as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the teaching of Froessl.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Saunders teaches a text store interface to permit an application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44.

Regarding independent claim 23, Saunders teaches receiving original raw data from at least one of a plurality of input devices in fig. 1, fig. 4, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 line 29, and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders discloses specifying a range within a document, wherein the range utilizes at least one floating position in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a method by which the handler is able to attach a property to the document at a range specified by the range object, wherein the property preserves a relationship between a text service and the identified range in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38. In col. 6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the range of text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text. Saunders does not, however teach that the property provides access to original data used for insertion of text within the range.

Froessl does teach storing original raw data in a property that is attachable to a document and attaching the property to a document, wherein the property preserves original raw data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Froessl into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the original raw data access facilitating text correction as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the teaching of Froessl.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Saunders teaches wherein at least two of the plurality of input devices can simultaneously provide the original raw data in fig. 1, fig. 4, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 line 29, and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Saunders does not teach providing a context that includes additional information about the original raw data and utilizing the context to convert the received original raw data into text. Froessl does teach providing a context that includes additional information about the original raw data and utilizing the context to convert the received original raw data into text in fig. 1, fig. 2, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 23, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Saunders and Froessl to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the context as taught by Froessl to have improved Saunders so that additional information would have been available to the user to assist in facilitating text correction using the original raw data.

Regarding dependent claim 26, Saunders teaches specifying a range of text to enable a text service to modify or replace the text in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38.

Saunders does not teach wherein the context is determined by the range specified within the document. Froessl does teach providing a context that includes additional information about the original raw data and utilizing the context to convert the received original raw data into text in fig. 1, fig. 2, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 23, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Saunders and Froessl to have created the claimed invention. In light of the suggested context teaching of Froessl, it would have been obvious and desirable to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the range specified within the document because it was known at the time of the invention that different portions of a document typically contain different kinds of information. This difference would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to have derived a context from these differences.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments regarding the claimed property preserving and providing access to original data with respect to claims 1-5 and 20-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Examiner has searched and found the prior art reference of Froessl in response to an improved understanding of the property preserving and providing access to originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction. The Examiner admits that Saunders does not store the original data when it is entered by one of the plurality of text input devices. However, Froessl does teach storing original data after it is input as text to and attaching it to a document as a property in order to facilitate a user with text correction should the text have been improperly entered into the document from the original data. Thus, the

Examiner believes a combination of Saunders and Froessl teaches the claimed limitation of a property attached to a range, which provides access to originally entered data to facilitate text correction. Saunders teachings identifying a range of text and reserving it for a specific text input service. Saunders uses an identifier property to link the range of text to the text service. However, new original data must be entered via the text input device when the range of text is being modified or replaced. Froessl teaches explicitly storing the original data when it is entered for the express purpose of facilitating text correction at a later point in time. Thus, the teaching of Froessl can be used to enhance Saunders by enabling the storage of original data when it is entered from one of the text input devices such as handwritten or speech input. Since Saunders already teaches associating the specific text service with a specific range of text, the original data would have been associated with the range of text which it was used to create as a result of the combination of teachings of Saunders and Froessl. Thus, the Examiner believes the combination of Saunders and Froessl renders this claimed limitation obvious.

7. Applicant's arguments regarding the prior art teachings of Maslov filed 4/4/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's argument in pages 7 and 8 that Maslov does not teach a dynamic text interface and a position represented as a floating anchor to a node, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 17 and in col. 3 lines 26-45, the Examiner notes that Maslov teaches performing manipulations upon a document tree, which includes selecting and manipulating nodes of the tree. When the user of Maslov is performing tree transformation operations, the nodes are marked with floating anchors under a reasonable interpretation of the floating anchor node as claimed. Thus, the Examiner

maintains that Maslov does in fact teaching a floating anchor node as claimed and in combination with Saunders and Froessl renders the claimed invention obvious.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. DeVito et al., US 5,825,943 patented 10/20/1998 discloses linking image data to text data.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
6/22/2005

/Heather Herndon/
HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100